UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,203	10/17/2003	Jarmo Kuusinen	NOKM.079PA	6660

7590   05/04/2007

Hollingsworth & Funk, LLC
Suite 125
8009 34th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55425

EXAMINER
JUNTIMA, NITTAYA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/688,203	KUUSINEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nittaya Juntima	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _08 February 2007_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _51-88_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _51-88_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _17 October 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the amendment filed on 2/8/2007.

2.   The objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph to the claims are

withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

3.   Claims 1-50 were cancelled, and claims 51-88 are pending.

4.   The indicated allowability of claims 51 and 71 as indicated in the previous Office action

dated 8/7/2006 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Lee (US

2002/0172338 A1). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 51, 66-72, and 79-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Soininen (WO 03/003767 A1) in view of Lee (US 2002/0172338 A1).

Regarding claim 51, as shown in Fig. 6, Soininen teaches a method for providing services

via a packet-switched multimedia network (PS in Fig. 1) to users (Ann's terminal 90 and Bob's

terminal 91) communicating in a circuit-switched domain (CS in Fig. 1), comprising:

Establishing a dialog (SIP dialog as shown in Fig. 6) between a plurality of terminals

(Ann's terminal 90 and Bob's terminal 91) using a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) via the PS

multimedia network (PS in Fig. 1). See page 9, third paragraph – page 10, second paragraph.

Wherein the establishing the dialog includes sending CS bearer information indicating

that a communication flow is requested via a CS network ("SIP parameters indicating that a CS

bearer should be used") and a caller line identifier associated with a terminal requesting the CS

connection (MSISDN of A's terminal is included in the SIP INVITE message as shown in step

103 of Fig. 6). See page 9, fourth paragraph – page 10, first paragraph.

Parsing a SIP message of the dialog to determine the CS bearer information (since "The

CS call is then established..," page 10, third paragraph, the SIP INVITE message containing SIP

parameters and MSISDN of A's terminal must be parsed and processed).

Effecting the communication flow between the plurality of terminals via the CS

network as directed by the CS bearer information in response to the SIP message ("The CS call

is then established..," page 10, third paragraph).

Soininen does not explicitly teach that (i) the dialog is established for the purpose of

establishing a CS connection involving at least one terminal that is incapable of engaging in

streaming communications via the PS multimedia network, and that (ii) the step of establishing

the dialog comprises including multimedia caller identification data in the dialog.

However, regarding (i), since Soininen teaches that the terminal A 90 in Fig. 6 is capable

of establishing a SIP dialog with another terminal, i.e. terminal B 91, via the PS network in order

to establish a CS connection for engaging in streaming communications, i.e. a voice call, (page 9,

third paragraph-page 10, third paragraph), it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at

the time of the invention to modify and apply the teaching of Soininen to a terminal that is

incapable of engaging in streaming communications via the PS multimedia network such that the

dialog would be established for the purpose of establishing a CS connection involving at least

one terminal that is incapable of engaging in streaming communications via the PS multimedia

network as recited in the claim. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to enable

the terminal that is incapable of engaging in streaming communications via the PS multimedia

network to still be able to engaging in streaming communications such as a voice call over a CS

bearer with another terminal as long as such terminal is capable of establishing a packet

signaling connection such as a SIP dialog with the other terminal via the PS network.

Regarding (ii), Lee teaches a multimedia communications system 100 in Fig. 1 and a

method of establishing a SIP dialog to provide two-way voice calls that comprises including

multimedia caller identification data in the dialog in steps 204-206 of Fig. 2 (Abstract,

paragraphs 18-20).

Given the teaching of Lee, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time

of the invention to modify the teaching of Soininen to include multimedia caller identification

data in the dialog such that (ii) the step of establishing the dialog would comprise including

multimedia caller identification data in the dialog as claimed. The suggestion/motivation to do

so would have been to provide multimedia caller identification data prior to an interactive

communications session on a multimedia communications network and advantageously permit

caller identification data to be associated with a caller rather than a device as suggested by Lee

(paragraph 5, lines 1-3 and third line from the bottom of paragraph 19).

Regarding claims 66-70, Soininen teaches providing an audio service (a voice call, page 9, fourth paragraph), and communicating real-time media/voice call quality/conversational of service class/streaming quality of service class (voice call) through the CS network (page 9, fourth paragraph).

Claim 71 is a method claim containing similar limitations to that of method claim 51, and is therefore rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 51.

Claim 72 is a terminal claim corresponding to method claim 51, and is therefore rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 51 with the addition of a processing system, a SIP user agent, and a user agent which must be included in the terminal (90 in Fig. 6) in order to perform the functions as recited in the claim.

Regarding claim 79, Soininen teaches the terminal (90 in Fig. 6) comprises a mobile station wirelessly coupled to the PS multimedia network and CS network via a RAN (RAN 4 in Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 80, as shown in Fig. 6, Soininen teaches a system (Fig. 6) for providing services via a packet-switched multimedia network (PS in Fig. 1) to users (Ann's terminal 90 and Bob's terminal 91) communicating time delay-sensitive information (voice call) over a circuit-switched domain (CS in Fig. 1), comprising:

A receiver terminal (terminal B 91) and a sender terminal (terminal A 90), wherein the sender terminal comprises:

A sender terminal processing system (an inherent processing system included in terminal A 90, page 9, fourth paragraph – page 10, first paragraph).

An inherent sender terminal SIP user agent operable via the sender terminal processing system must be included in order to cause the sender terminal processing system to initiate a dialog (SIP INVITE) with the receiver terminal (terminal B 91) through the packet-switched multimedia network (PS in Fig. 1), wherein establishing the dialog includes sending the CS bearer information indicating that a communication flow is requested via a CS network ("SIP parameters indicating that a CS bearer should be used") and a caller line identifier associated with the sender terminal (MSISDN of A's terminal) (page 9, fourth paragraph – page 10, first paragraph).

An inherent sender terminal CS communication user agent operable via the sender terminal processing system must be included in order to cause the sender terminal processing system to effect the communication flow with the receiver terminal via the CS network as directed by the CS bearer information ("The CS call is then established..," page 10, third paragraph).

Wherein the receiver terminal (terminal B 91 in Fig. 6) comprises:

A receiver terminal processing system (an inherent processing system included in terminal B 91, page 9, fourth paragraph – page 10, first paragraph).

An inherent receiver terminal SIP user agent operable via the recipient terminal processing system must be included in order to cause the receiver terminal processing system to recognize the CS bearer information, and to respond to the sender terminal (terminal A 90)

acknowledging receipt of the CS bearer information (OK message sent from terminal B 91 to

terminal A 90, page 10, paragraphs 1-3).

An inherent receiver terminal CS communication user agent operable via the

receiver terminal processing system must be included in order to cause the receiver terminal

processing system to effect the communication flow with the sender terminal (terminal A 90) via

the CS network as directed by the CS bearer information ("The CS call is then established..,"

page 10, third paragraph).

However, Soininen does not explicitly teach (i) an IMS, (ii) that at least one of the sender

and receiver terminals is incapable of engaging in streaming communications via the IMS, and

(iii) the step of establishing the dialog involves including multimedia caller line identification

data in the dialog as recited in the claim.

Regarding (i) and (iii), Lee teaches a multimedia communications system 100 that

includes a CSCF 114 for coordinating and executing SIP session and elements 124, 126, and 130

in Fig. 1 that provides multimedia services (collectively constitute an IP Multimedia Subsystem

IMS providing IMS-based services, paragraphs 5, 11, and 18) and a method of establishing a SIP

dialog to provide two-way voice calls that comprises including multimedia caller identification

data in the dialog in steps 204-206 of Fig. 2 by a user terminal 102 (Abstract, paragraphs 18-20).

Because Soininen further suggests that the same procedure can be used if CSCFs are

involved (page 10, third paragraph), and given the teaching of Lee on a multimedia system

having CSCF for coordinating and executing SIP session, it would have been obvious to one

skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined teaching of

Soininen to incorporate the IMS as recited in the claim. The motivation/suggestion would have

been to utilize the system when CSCFs are used as suggested by Soininen (page 10, third

paragraph) and to provide multimedia caller identification data prior to an interactive

communications session on a multimedia communications network as taught by Lee (paragraph

5).

Regarding (ii), since Soininen also teaches that the terminal A 90 in Fig. 6 is capable of

establishing a SIP dialog with another terminal, i.e. terminal B 91, via the PS network in order to

establish a CS connection for engaging in streaming communication, i.e. a voice call, (page 9,

third paragraph-page 10, third paragraph), it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at

the time of the invention to modify and apply the teaching of Soininen to a terminal that is

incapable of engaging in streaming communications via an IMS such that the dialog would be

established for the purpose of establishing a CS connection involving at least one terminal that is

incapable of engaging in streaming communications via the IMS as recited in the claim. The

suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to enable the terminal that is incapable of

engaging in streaming communications via the IMS to still be able to engaging in streaming

communication such as a voice call over a CS bearer with another terminal as long as such

terminal is capable of establishing a packet signaling connection such as a SIP dialog with the

other terminal via the PS network.

Claim 81 is a computer-readable medium having instructions stored thereon which are

executable by a computer system claim corresponding to method claim 51, and is therefore

rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 51.

7.   Claims 52-61, 64, 73-76, and 84-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Soininen (WO 03/003767 A1) in view of Lee (US 2002/0172338 A1), and

further in view of *"SDP: Session Description Protocol"* by Handley et al. ("Handley").

Regarding claims 52 and 64, Soininen further teaches wherein establishing the dialog

between the plurality of terminals (90 and 91, Fig. 6) comprises sending a SIP INVITE message

from a first (Ann's terminal 90) of the plurality of terminals to a second (Bob's terminal 91) of

the plurality of terminals. Although Soininen further teaches that SIP parameters of the SIP

INVITE contain the CS bearer information, i.e. an indication that a CS bearer should be used and

the MSISDN of A's terminal (page 9, fourth paragraph and page 10, first paragraph) and a SDP

(page 4, second paragraph), Soininen does not explicitly teach that the CS bearer information is

communicated by way of a session description provided via a message body of the SIP

INVITE/a session description definition provided via the dialog.

However, Handely teaches a session description with SDP extension that may be

extended and tailored to a particular application or media ("The 'attribute' mechanism... is the

primary means for extending SDP and tailoring it to particular applications or media...others

may be added on an application-, media- or session-specific basis," pages 7-8, and "Additional

parameters may be defined in the future, page 22, line 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Soininen to include the session description of Handely such

that the CS bearer information is communicated by way of a session description provided via a

message body of the SIP INVITE/a session description definition provided via the dialog would

be included as recited in the claim. The motivation/suggestion to do so would have been to tailor

the session description to a particular application, e.g. CS application, as taught by Handley
(page 8).

Regarding claim 53, Soininen does not teach that establishing a dialog between the
plurality of terminals (90 and 91, Fig. 6) comprises communicating CS bearer information (SIP
parameters indicating that a CS bearer should be used and MSISDN of A's terminal) via the
dialog by way of a SDP message having SDP extension indicating the CS bearer information.

However, Handely teaches SDP extension that may be extended and tailored to a
particular application or media ("The 'attribute' mechanism... is the primary means for
extending SDP and tailoring it to particular applications or media...others may be added on an
application-, media- or session-specific basis," page 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention
was made to modify the teaching of Soininen to include the SDP extension of Handely such that
a SDP message with SDP extension indicating the CS bearer information would be included as
recited in the claim. The motivation/suggestion to do so would have been to tailor the SDP
extensions to a particular application, e.g. CS application, as taught by Handley (page 8).

Regarding claims 54, 56, and 59, although Soininen teaches the CS bearer information
(SIP parameters of the SIP INVITE indicating that a CS bearer should be used and MSISDN of
A's terminal, page 9, fourth paragraph and page 10, first paragraph), Soininen fails to explicitly
teach that communicating of the CS bearer information by way of the SDP message further

comprises communicating at least some of the CS bearer information via an SDP connection data field identifying the CS network as recited in the claims.

However, Handley teaches an SDP connection data field (Connection data, page 12), "c=" field for each media description, or a "c=" field with one additional "c=" field at the session-level, or both for allowing SDP to be used for sessions that are not IP based (page 12).

Given the teaching of Handley, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Soininen to include the SDP connection data field such that at least some of the CS bearer information via an SDP connection data field identifying the CS network would be communicated. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to utilize the connection data field for allowing SDP to be used for sessions that are not IP based, as taught by Handley (page 12) and such modification of an SDP message format and contents only involves routine skill in the art.

Regarding claims 55 and 58, although Soininen teaches the CS bearer information (SIP parameters of the SIP INVITE indicating that a CS bearer should be used and MSISDN of A's terminal, page 9, fourth paragraph and page 10, first paragraph), Soininen fails to explicitly teach that communicating of the CS bearer information by way of the SDP message further comprises communicating at least some of the CS bearer information via a sub-field of a media type and a sub-field of an application media type as recited in the claims.

However, Handely teaches a sub-field of a media type/a sub-field of an application media type in an SDP which may be extended as new communication modalities emerge (page 19).

Given the teaching of Handley, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Soininen to include a sub-field of a media

type/a sub-field of an application media type such that at least some of the CS bearer information

would be communicated via a sub-field of a media type/a sub-field of an application media type

particular to communication flows via the CS network as recited in the claims. The

motivation/suggestion to do so would have been to enable the sub-field to be extended to cover

new communication, e.g. circuit bearer connection, as taught by Handley (page 19), since such

modification of an SDP message format and contents only involves routine skill in the art.

Regarding claims 57, 60, and 61, although Soininen teaches the CS bearer information

(SIP parameters of the SIP INVITE indicating that a CS bearer should be used and MSISDN of

A's terminal, page 9, fourth paragraph and page 10, first paragraph), Soininen fails to teach that

communicating of the CS bearer information by way of the SDP message further comprises

communicating at least some of the CS bearer information via SDP attribute/a session-level

attribute indicative of a type of the communication flow to be effected via the CS network as

recited in the claims.

Handley, however, teaches an SDP attribute which additional fields may be added to

convey additional information that is specific to an application, a media, or a session (pages 8

and 19)

Given the teaching of Handley, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Soininen to include the SDP attribute

which additional fields such that communicating at least some of the CS bearer information via

an SDP attribute/a session-level attribute indicative of a type of the communication flow to be effected via the CS network would be included. The motivation/suggestion to do so would have been to convey additional information that is specific to a session, e.g. usage of circuit connection, as taught by Hanley (page 8), since such modification of an SDP message format and contents only involves routine skill in the art.

Claims 73-76 are terminal claims containing limitations corresponding to method claims 53, 55, 58, and 61, respectively, and are therefore rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claims 53, 55, 58, and 61, respectively.

Claim 84 is computer-readable medium claim containing limitation corresponding to methods claim 53, and is therefore rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 53.

Regarding claim 85, although Soininen teaches inherent instructions for communicating the CS bearer information (SIP parameters of the SIP INVITE indicating that a CS bearer should be used and MSISDN of A's terminal, page 9, fourth paragraph and page 10, first paragraph), Soininen fails to teach the instructions for communicating of the CS bearer information by way of the SDP message further comprises communicating at least some of the CS bearer information via a media type as recited in the claim.

However, Handley teaches a media type in an SDP which may be extended as new communication modalities emerge (page 19).

Given the teaching of Handley, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Soininen to include a media type such that the instructions for communicating at least some of the CS bearer information via a media type particular to communication flows via the CS network would be included as recited in the claims. The motivation/suggestion to do so would have been to enable the media type to be extended to cover new communication, e.g. circuit bearer connection, as taught by Handley (page 19), since such modification of an SDP message format and contents only involves routine skill in the art.

Claims 86-88 are computer-readable medium claims containing limitation corresponding to methods claims 55, 58, and 61, respectively, and are therefore rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claims 55, 58, and 61, respectively.

8.   Claims 62-63, 65, 77-78, and 82-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soininen (WO 03/003767 A1) in view of Lee (US 2002/0172338 A1), and further in view of Kotzin (US 2004/0120505 A1).

Regarding claims 62-63, and 65, Soininen teaches communicating the CS bearer information ("SIP parameters indicating that a CS bearer should be used" and MSISDN of A's terminal, page 9, fourth paragraph – page 10, first paragraph) using a SIP message (SIP INVITE page 9, fourth paragraph- page 10, first paragraph).

The combined teaching of Soininen and Lee fails to teach communicating the CS bearer information by way of a CS-specific content type value associated with a SIP Content-Type

header/a CS-specific value associated with a CS-specific SIP header as recited in the claims.

However, in an analogous environment specific to voice alert, Kotzin teaches a SIP

header (Fig. 5) having a Content-Type: application/SDP in the SIP header and content-type field

511, content-encoding field 513, and content-length 515, and ASCII characters (517) that are

specific to voice alert application (paragraph 0031).

Given the teaching of Kotzin, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the combined teaching of Soininen and Lee to include the

Content-Type SIP header such that communicating at least some of the CS bearer information by

way of a CS-specific content type value associated with a SIP Content-Type header/a CS-

specific value associated with a CS-specific SIP header would be included. The

motivation/suggestion to do so would have been to provide a Content-Type SIP header specific

to an application, e.g. circuit-switching application, and such modification of a SIP header

simply involves routine skill in the art.

Claims 77-78 are terminal claims containing limitations corresponding to method claims

62-63, respectively, and are therefore rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of

claims 62-63, respectively.

Claims 82-83 are computer-readable medium claims containing limitation corresponding

to methods claims 62-63, respectively, and are therefore rejected under the same reason set forth

in the rejection of claims 62-63, respectively.

Conclusion

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nittaya Juntima whose telephone number is 571-272-3120. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 A.M - 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on 571-272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nittaya Juntima
April 20, 2007

HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600